

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for his careful and very thorough Office Action. The Examiner is particularly thanked for the helpful suggestions regarding correction of the alleged informalities. The claims presently outstanding are Claims 1-11. By the foregoing amendment, Claim 3 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice.

Section 112(2) ("Clearly and Distinctly Setting Forth")

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice by the above amendment. This rejection is traversed and is now believed to be moot.

Art Rejections

The art rejections are all respectfully traversed.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC Section 102(b) as being anticipated by *Felde*.

All claims of the present application recite cubic boron nitride. There is no mention of this element in *Felde*. Therefore, there is no anticipation.

The claim language of Claim 1 is not met. Specifically, Claim 1 recites "cutting tips comprising cubic boron nitride, and being attached to said carrier body; wherein said cutting tips, as attached to said carrier body, define positive respective hook angles of 5 degrees or greater." *Felde* does not disclose the use of cubic boron nitride or a positive respective hook angle. If *Felde* does mention such elements, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out exactly where in the cited reference such elements are mentioned.

According to the Federal Circuit:

For a prior art reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim with sufficient clarity to prove its existence in the prior art.

Motorola, Inc., v. Interdigital Tech. Corp., 43 USPQ 2d 1481, 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Therefore, a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 10 also recites features not shown or suggested by *Beaton*. Specifically, Claim 10 recites **"attaching one or more cutting tips, comprising cubic boron nitride, to a carrier body."** Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Dependent Claims 2, 4-9 and 11, which depend directly from independent Claims 1 and 10 and incorporate all the limitations thereof, also include additional limitations that are not shown or suggested by *Felde*.

Claim 2 recites **"wherein each said cutting tip is a layered combination of cubic boron nitride and tungsten carbide."**

Thus, for the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Thus, all grounds of rejection and/or objection are traversed or accommodated, and favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney or Robert Groover for an interview to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,



N. Elizabeth Pham, Reg.No. 49,042

Attorney for Applicant

11330 Valley Dale Drive, Dallas TX 75230

214-363-3038

groover@technopatents.com

August 6, 2003

OFFICIAL